

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-30 are pending in the present application. Claims 1 and 16 have been amended.

**Rejection of Claims 1 and 16 Under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 1 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as not providing sufficient antecedent basis for the following limitations: “matchable text pattern file,” “text pattern,” “text patterns,” and “user terminal.” Claims 1 and 16 have been amended to address the rejection. The undersigned representative respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1 and 16.

**Rejection of Claims 1, 10-16, and 25-30 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 1, 10-16, and 25-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cochran (U.S. Patent No. 5,995,979) (“Cochran”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Cochran does not disclose, as recited in claim 1, “inputting at one of the plurality of user terminals a search request text pattern ... including a text string ... to further define the search request text pattern and to further identify the server being invoked among the plurality of servers,” (emphasis added) (Claim 16 has a similar limitation).

Cochran discloses that the user selects from list identifiers, which are “terms or phrases identifying various categories of information that the user may select when formulating a search strategy.” Col. 7, lines 19-21. The user in Cochran is choosing a search from a list of various categories. In the present application, the user “inputs” a search request text pattern including a text string to further define the search request text pattern and to further identify the server being invoked. Cochran transmits the list identifiers from the server to the user. Col. 7, lines 9-18. As a result, the user only searches the server that transmitted the list identifiers. The user in Cochran is unable to “identify the server” because only one server is being searched. Thus, Cochran has no need to identify the server.

Additionally, claim 1 recites, “determining a match of the search request text pattern against the matchable text pattern file of sanctioned entities in the server.” (emphasis added) (Claim 16 has a similar limitation). Cochran, however, teaches away from determining a match by presenting to the user only search terms that will return a hit:

Only choices or search terms that are actually available are presented to the user. Hence, users are never put in the position of failing to find information that meet the criteria they have chosen. Only search terms that will return a "hit" are presented on the display device. Likewise, the user will be informed even of words that are misspelled on the database. (Cochran; Col. 4, lines 29-35).

For at least the reasons stated above, as well as the reasons stated in the prior response, Cochran does not teach or suggest, or make obvious, independent claims 1 or 16 of the present application. Therefore, the undersigned respectfully submits that independent claims 1 and 16 are allowable over the cited art. Further, dependent claims 10-15 and 25-30 are also allowable as they contain the limitations of the claims on which they depend.

Thus, the undersigned representative respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1, 10-16, and 25-30.

**Rejection of Claims 2-5 and 17-20 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 2-5 and 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cochran in view of “Compliance Solutions.” This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 2-5 and 17-20 are dependent upon claims 1 and 16 which are submitted to be allowable in view of Cochran for the reasons set forth above. Accordingly, claims 2-5 and 17-20 should be allowable under Cochran for these reasons as well. Further arguments are reserved with respect to dependent claims 2-5 and 17-20. Because “Compliance Solutions” does not teach or suggest the

deficiencies of Cochran, claims 2-5 and 17-20 are not obvious in view of the cited references and should therefore be allowed. Therefore, the undersigned representative respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 2-5 and 17-20.

**Rejection of Claims 6-9 and 21-24 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 6-9 and 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cochran and “Compliance Solutions” in view of High, Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,842,219) (“High”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.


Claims 6-9 and 21-24 are dependent upon claims 1 and 16 which are submitted to be allowable in view of Cochran for the reasons set forth above. Accordingly, claims 6-9 and 21-24 should be allowable under Cochran for these reasons as well. Further arguments are reserved with respect to dependent claims 6-9 and 21-24. Because “Compliance Solutions” and High do not teach or suggest the deficiencies of Cochran, claims 6-9 and 21-24 are not obvious in view of the cited references and should therefore be allowed.

CONCLUSION

The undersigned believes that claims 1-30 are allowable over the cited references and respectfully requests a notice of allowance to this effect. Should the Examiner determine that any further action is necessary to place this application into better form, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned representative at the number listed below. In addition, if any additional fees are required in connection with the filing of this response, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the same to Deposit Account No. 501458.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 1/11/06  
KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP  
607 14th Street, N.W., Suite 900  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
(202) 508-5800

By:   
John W. Ball, Jr.  
Registration No. 44,433